UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                     | FILING DATE                  | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR  | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/763,194  | 02/20/2001                   | Kazunobu Fujikawa     | Q63075              | 3832             |  |
| SUGHRUE, M  | 7590 11/18/200<br>ION, ZINN, | EXAMINER              |                     |                  |  |
| MACPEAK &   | SEAS                         | ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA |                     |                  |  |
| 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW<br>Washington, DC 20037 |                              |                       | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|   |                              |                       | 3742                |                  |  |
|   |                              |                       |                     |                  |  |
|   |                              |                       | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|   |                              |                       | 11/18/2008          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No.   | Applicant(s)    |  |
|-------------------|-----------------|--|
| 09/763,194        | FUJIKAWA ET AL. |  |
| Examiner          | Art Unit        |  |
| M. Alexandra Elve | 3742            |  |

|  | W. Alexandra Elve  | 0742  |
|--|--|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | correspondence address  |
| THE REPLY FILED 09 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A  | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR  | R ALLOWANCE.  |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:  | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi<br>eal (with appeal fee) in compliance       | t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request                |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing   | date of the final rejection.   |   |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f  | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE            | g date of the final rejection.  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount<br>hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi  | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a  |
| AMENDMENTS   |  |   |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below   | nsideration and/or search (see NO  |   |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or  | ,,,  |   |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c<br>NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   | corresponding number of finally reje   | ected claims.   |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12   | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co  | mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).   |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |  | ,   |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allenged non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   | owable if submitted in a separate,   |   |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  | I be entered and an explanation of  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  |  |   |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary   | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea  | al and/or appellant fails to provide a  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | n of the status of the claims after e  | ntry is below or attached.  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but<br/>See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>  | does NOT place the application ir  | condition for allowance because:  |
| <ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>   | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)   |   |
| November 17, 2008.   | /M. Alexandra Elve/<br>Primary Examiner, Art U                                   | Init 3742   |
|  |  |   |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Inoue does not teach a recess with surface discharge material adhered to it. The examiner respectfully notes that Inoue discloses the presence of wire electrode recesses, and the use of coatings, such as powder atomization and plasma spraying. With respect to the discharge material this is taught by Scarpelli. Applicant argues that multiple wires with recesses and surface discharge material are not taught. The examiner respectfully disagrees because Inoue does teach edm wire electrodes with recesses and the use of powder coatings. Bonga teaches a multiple wire changer and Scarpelli teaches a surface discharge coating on an edm wire electrode. All arguments set forth in the instant after final are well taken, however, rejections of the claims under the prior art is sustained for the reasons set forth in the final office action.